REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 23, 2003 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-27 remain pending in this application, of which the independent claims are 1 and 23-26. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

A new set of formal drawings, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.84, is enclosed and includes FIGs.1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2A, 2B and 3.

The abstract of the disclosure stands objected to, under 37 CFR 1.72, for excessive length. The abstract has now been shortened appropriately.

Claims 1, 6-8, 12-17 and 19-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,496 to Li et al. ("Li").

Claim 1 recites:

"A process . . .comprising the steps of: . . . (b) determining whether the browser has been previously bookmarked for a web page of a web site presently accessed by the particular user of the browser; . . . (e) determining whether the record count has reached a predetermined as threshold of visitation; (f) prompting the user as to whether it is desired to bookmark the webpage if it is determined in step (e) that the threshold has been reached . . ." The Li reference fails to disclose or suggest the above-quoted claim limitation.

Page 3 of the Office Action cites in the Li patent, whose columns each have 67 lines, step (f) as being disclosed at col. 5, lines 15-67 and col. 6, lines 22-67.

To the best of the applicants' understanding, the passage deemed to be most relevant is col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 1, which states:

"During refresh, if the system finds that a given URL has been moved, the Dead_link field is set to "true" and PowerBookmarks allows a user to specify a criterion for automated removal of the dead links and inactive bookmarks." Removal of "dead links" is further described at col. 11, lines 28-34.

In effect, when the database system 100 periodically updates or "refreshes" its information, it may discover that a Universal Resource Locator (URL or "Internet address") that has been bookmarked by the system 100 no longer points to a web page retrievable at that URL. That is, the URL references an "inactive bookmark" (col. 6, line 1: "inactive bookmark"). At this point in time, i.e., at a refresh, the user may specify to the system 100 a criterion according to which the system 100 can automatically remove inactive bookmarks.

It is therefore submitted by the applicants that Li fails to disclose or suggest "prompting the user as to whether it is desired to bookmark the webpage if it is determined in step (e) that the threshold has been reached . . .," at least since the Li passage refers to a general criterion for all web pages whereas the invention as recited in claim 1 specifically recites "a web page of a web site presently accessed."

Moreover, Li fails to disclose or suggest "(f) prompting the user as to whether it is desired to bookmark the webpage if it is determined in step (e) that the threshold has been reached," at least since Li makes a decision as whether to retain a bookmark.

Additionally, Li fails to disclose or suggest "(f) prompting the user as to whether it is desired to bookmark the webpage if it is determined in step (e) that the

threshold has been reached," at least since there is no disclosure or suggestion of any Li prompting that is responsive to any such determination.

Further, Li fails to disclose or suggest "(b) determining whether the browser has been previously bookmarked for a web page of a web site presently accessed by the particular user of the browser," at least because Li fails to disclose or suggest bookmarking of a browser. Instead, Li bookmarks a user_ID irrespective of the browser (col. 6, lines 25-28; col. 10, lines 26-29), e.g., irrespective of which browser on the desktop is currently active if both of the browsers have the same user_ID.

As a further point, Li fails to disclose or suggest "(b) determining whether the browser has been previously bookmarked for a web page of a web site presently accessed by the particular user of the browser." Firstly, the inactive bookmark cleanup process during system refresh fails to access any web page that would be bookmarked. Secondly, although Li keeps an "access_frequency" and compares it to threshold, Li fails to disclose or suggest "(b) determining whether the browser has been previously bookmarked for a web page of a web site presently accessed . . ."

For at least all of the above reasons, the applicants submit that Li fails to anticipate or render obvious the invention as recited in claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Although page 6 of the Office Action dismisses claims 23-27 as "combinations and subcombinations of previously rejected claims," the applicants do not agree and, in any event, do not believe that Li can properly be seen as anticipating or rendering obvious any of claims 23-27.

For example, step (f) of claim 23 recites "recommending to the user that the webpage be bookmarked if it is determined in step (e) that the predetermined threshold of the visitation count has been reached." The Office Action is apparently citing the above-described inactive-bookmark removal criterion designation which, as set forth above, does not amount to disclosure or suggestion of this claim limitation.

As to claim 24, step (a) is similar to step (b) of claim 1, and is likewise believed not to be disclosed in or suggested by Li.

Moreover, Li also fails to disclose or suggest step (b) of claim 24, as set forth in the analysis above.

Claim 25 similarly recites a program module that "bookmarks the browser" which step is neither disclosed nor suggested by Li.

Step (iii) of claim 26 is similar to step (f) of claim 23. Claim 26 is likewise believed to be patentable over Li for at least this reason.

Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0083148 to Shaw et al. ("Shaw").

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 1. Shaw relates to caching personalized content, but cannot make up for the deficiencies in Li.

Claims 2-5 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Li.

Claims 2-5 and 18 depend from claim 1. In accordance with the above analysis, Li fails to render obvious the invention as recited in claims 2-5 and 18 at least due to its failure to disclose or suggest the various above-referenced limitations of claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above claim rejections is respectfully requested.

As to the other rejected claims, each is believed to distinguish patentably over the applied prior art reference(s) due to its dependency from a base claim. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Waxler
Registration No. 48,027

Date: 1/22/04

By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:
Aaron Waxler, Registration No. 48,027
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDEMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450 ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on 1/22/04.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)

(Signature and Date)